## CHANUCEY SMITH.

MARCH 1, 1860.-Laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUTCHINS, from the Committee on Claims, made the following

## REPORT.

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the petition of Chauncey Smith, "asking to be paid for secret service rendered the United States in 1812-'15 by his father, Arnold Smith," have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report:

That this is a claim for \$800, supposed to be due the late Arnold Smith, father of the petitioner, for secret services on the St. Lawrence during the war of 1812. It is suggested in the petition that a contract may have existed; but none is produced, and no evidence that any ever did exist. Nor is there any evidence that a balance was due the said Arnold Smith for secret or any other kind of service. The evidence before your committee only goes to show that the father of the claimant was in some way connected with the public service on the St. Lawrence, but the witnesses do not profess to know anything of the accounts as they existed between the government and said Arnold Smith. Your committee do not perceive the slightest foundation for a claim against the United States, and they therefore report the petition back to the House, and recommend that the prayer of the petitioner be not granted.

## HTIME YEDUKARD

betainged at her his balle and as his I washing

Mr. Hurosuss, from the Committee on Claims, made the following

## THOUGH

The Committee on Chains, to whom one replaced the patition of Chaumony Smith, "acting to be post for search service readered the United States in 1112-'15 by his father, Arnold Smith," have had the same under consideration, and bey lance to veport:

That this is a chain for \$300, supposed to be due the Argold Smith, faillier of the politioner, for a crei services on the St. In wrange during the war of 1812. It is supposed in the polition that a confirmal may have existed; but noise is produced, and no evidence that any ever did exist. Nor is there say evidence that a balance was due the said Argold Smith for searce or any other kind of service. The evidence before your committee only your to show that the tarbar of the claiment was in some way connected with the public service on the St. Lawrence, but the witnesses do not profess to know anything of the accounts as they existed between the government and said Argold Smith. Your committee to not perceive the algabest foundation for a claim against the United States, and they therefore report the petition back to the House, and recommend that the prayer of the petitioner be not granted.